UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE
54th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 8 December 1993
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 54th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KUKAN (Slovakia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 107: ELIMINATION OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 114: HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued)*

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS (continued)

(b) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS, INCLUDING ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued)

(c) HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATIONS AND REPORTS OF SPECIAL RAPPORTEURS AND REPRESENTATIVES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 115: SITUATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN ESTONIA AND LATVIA (continued)*

AGENDA ITEM 172: NECESSITY OF ADOPTING EFFECTIVE MEASURES FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WHO ARE VICTIMS OF ESPECIALLY DIFFICULT CIRCUMSTANCES, INCLUDING ARMED CONFLICTS (continued)*

---

* Items considered together.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/48/SR.54
8 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82891 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 107: ELIMINATION OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (A/C.3/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.3/48/L.80)

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.13/Rev.1

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.13/Rev.1, entitled "Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination", and drew attention to the programme budget implications in document A/C.3/48/L.80. When the revised draft resolution had been introduced at the 48th meeting, technical corrections to the text had been read out by the Secretary of the Committee.

2. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted.

3. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the following decision concerning document A/48/558 submitted under item 107:

> "The General Assembly takes note of the draft model national legislation for the guidance of Governments in the enactment of further legislation against racial discrimination, revised by the Secretariat in accordance with the comments made by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination at its fortieth and forty-first sessions (A/48/558)."

4. It was so decided.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 107.

AGENDA ITEM 114: HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.53)

(b) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS, INCLUDING ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.38, L.49, L.54 and L.80)

(c) HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATIONS AND REPORTS OF SPECIAL RAPPORTEURS AND REPRESENTATIVES (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.68/Rev.1)

AGENDA ITEM 115: SITUATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN ESTONIA AND LATVIA (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.37/Rev.2)

AGENDA ITEM 172: NECESSITY OF ADOPTING EFFECTIVE MEASURES FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WHO ARE VICTIMS OF ESPECIALLY DIFFICULT CIRCUMSTANCES, INCLUDING ARMED CONFLICTS (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.40)

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.38

6. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.38, entitled "World Conference on Human Rights", and drew attention to the programme budget implications in document A/C.3/48/L.80. The sponsors had been joined by Ecuador, Guinea, Honduras, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Mauritania, Monaco, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, the Sudar Thailand, Uganda, the United Kingdom and Uruguay.

7. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.38 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.40

8. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.40, entitled "Protection of children affected by armed conflicts", and drew attention to its programme budget implications in document A/C.3/48/L.82. The sponsors had been joined by Afghanistan, Andorra, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cyprus, Egypt, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Rwanda, Tajikistan and Togo.

9. Mr. ROSENBERG (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the phrase "in particular, measures to ensure proper medical care and adequate nutrition," should be inserted after the word "reintegration" in paragraph 7.

10. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.40, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49

11. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, entitled "Strengthening of the Centre for Human Rights of the Secretariat", paragraph 6 of which had been orally revised by the sponsors at the previous meeting. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications and Latvia had joined its sponsors. He invited the Secretary of the Committee to respond to a question raised by the representative of Cuba concerning paragraphs 2 and 6 of the draft resolution.

12. Ms. KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 requested the Secretary-General to make additional proposals in order to further increase the resources of the human rights programme in 1994-1995. In the context of the proposed programme budget for 1994-1995, the Secretary-General had made proposals to increase resources for the Centre for Human Rights. Those proposals were being reviewed currently by the Fifth Committee.

13. Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General and Member States to ensure that additional resources from the regular budget were accorded to the Centre for Human Rights to enable it to carry out, in full and on time, the mandates contained in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. In that regard, it would be recalled that draft resolution

(Ms. Kamal)

A/C.3/48/L.38 endorsed the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action and requested the Secretary-General to take further action with a view to the full implementation of all recommendations of the Conference. In connection with draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.38, a statement of programme budget implications had been issued (A/C.3/48/L.80) and dealt with the provisions of the Programme of Action that would give rise to the need for additional resources. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 also called for carrying out the mandates in the Programme of Action. As the additional requirements for the Programme of Action had been dealt with in the statement of programme budget implications (A/C.3/48/L.80) covering draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.38, there was no need for an additional statement.

14. Following the action taken by the Third Committee on those draft resolutions, the issue of additional resources would be dealt with by the Fifth Committee. Lastly, with regard to draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, the Committee should bear in mind General Assembly resolution 45/248 B VI, which reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and expressed its concern at the tendency of its substantive Committees and other intergovernmental bodies to involve themselves in administrative and budgetary matters.

15. Mr. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that his delegation did not find the explanation provided by the Secretary of the Committee entirely satisfactory. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 45/248 B VI, the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters. Paragraphs 2 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 sought to intrude into the work of the Fifth Committee by prejudging the decision to be taken by that Committee on the amount of resources to be allocated to the Centre for Human Rights. Furthermore, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, each draft resolution having financial implications should be accompanied by a separate statement of its programme budget implications. That had not been done with regard to a number of draft resolutions, including draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49. His delegation continued to have reservations concerning paragraphs 2 and 6 of the draft resolution under consideration and therefore proposed that in paragraph 6, the word "additional" should be replaced by the word "adequate".

16. The CHAIRMAN said that Andorra, Sierra Leone, Tajikistan and the United Kingdom had indicated that they wished to join the sponsors.

17. Mr. DRAKAKIS (Greece), speaking as one of the sponsors, said that over the past four years the Third Committee, which was the main policy-making body in the General Assembly on human rights questions, had seen fit to express its views on strengthening the Centre for Human Rights. No one was calling into question the fact that it was the task of the Fifth Committee to determine the budgetary implications of draft resolutions and the amount of resources to be allocated. In draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, the Third Committee would only be expressing its concern about the need to strengthen the Centre in a general

(Mr. Drakakis, Greece)

manner. Paragraphs 2 and 6 reflected the desire of the members of the Committee to strengthen the Centre, which was the main tool for implementing resolutions adopted by the Committee as well as the recommendations set forth in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. The wording of the two paragraphs was in accordance with the spirit of those documents. Approximately 90 delegations shared that view and it was his hope that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus in accordance with the practice followed by the Committee in dealing with human rights questions.

18. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) supported the views expressed by the Greek representative; paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 merely requested new proposals from the Secretary-General with a view to increasing the resources allocated to human-rights activities, and did not therefore encroach on the work of the Fifth Committee. Paragraph 6, as orally amended, also met the concerns of the Cuban representative, whom she therefore urged to refrain from pressing for any further amendments.

19. Mr. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that the positions of all delegations should be met with a view to reaching consensus. His delegation was willing to co-sponsor the draft resolution, provided that its legitimate concerns were addressed. Paragraph 6 should be amended as he had proposed in order to comply with General Assembly resolution 45/248 B VI and rule 153 of the rules of procedure, according to which administrative and budgetary matters were beyond the scope of the Third Committee.

20. Ms. SEMAFUMU (Uganda) reiterated her concern that several programme budget implications had been encompassed together in A/C.3/48/L.80. She added that if the additional proposals referred to in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution were over and above the implications set forth in document A/C.3/48/L.80, her delegation would share the concerns expressed by the Cuban representative with regard to that paragraph.

21. Mr. VAN DER HEIJDEN (Netherlands) supported the views expressed by the Greek representative. Unlike Cuba, he believed that General Assembly resolution 45/248 B VI was aimed at avoiding micro-management by Main Committees other than the Fifth Committee. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 involved no micro-management and complied fully with the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (A/CONF.157/23), part II, paragraph 9.

22. Mr. BIGGAR (Ireland) endorsed the views of Greece, Costa Rica and the Netherlands. He said he failed to understand Cuba's difficulties, given the agreement among Committee members that all decisions concerning the allocation of resources lay solely with the Fifth Committee. As document A/C.3/48/L.80 had already stated the need for additional requirements, he saw no reason to alter the wording of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, paragraph 6. With regard to paragraph 2 of that draft resolution, it was clear from the statement given by the Secretary of the Committee that additional proposals already made by the Secretary-General were under consideration by the Fifth Committee. No further amendments were therefore required, since both paragraphs fully reflected the reality of the situation.

23. Mrs. ARUNGU-OLENDE (Kenya) pointed out that further clarification was needed, since the Committee had not received a statement of programme budget implications from the Fifth Committee with specific regard to draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49.

24. Mr. HAMZAH (Singapore) said he believed that the Cuban representative had made a valid point which was not intended to undermine the consensus within the Committee with regard to strengthening the Centre for Human Rights. He also agreed that a statement of programme budget implications should have been provided for the draft resolution in question. With a view to addressing Cuba's concerns and to achieving consensus, he proposed that paragraph 2 should be amended to read: "Requests the Secretary-General to consider making additional proposals with a view to further increasing ..."; and that paragraph 6 should be amended to read: "... and Member States to consider ensuring ...". He further emphasized that, in line with the Vienna Declaration, any further amounts to be allocated to the human-rights programme should emanate only from within existing budgets and from extrabudgetary resources.

25. Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile) said he subscribed to the views of the Greek representative. However, as Cuba had not stated that it opposed any recommendation of the Committee to strengthen the Centre for Human Rights, he believed that it was unnecessary to amend the text of the draft resolution.

26. Ms. FOSTIER (Belgium) said that she agreed with the preceding speaker and that the Committee should send a policy message to the Fifth Committee, in which connection she also subscribed to the comments made by the Greek representative.

27. Mr. EL DEEB (Egypt) said that Egypt's co-sponsorship of the draft resolution reflected its desire to strengthen the Centre for Human Rights. None the less, Cuba's proposal reflected the concerns of various developing countries, including his own, while Kenya's comments were also relevant. He therefore urged the Committee to adopt the compromise formula proposed by Singapore with a view to reaching a final decision on the draft resolution.

28. Mr. SERGIWA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) supported the view that encompassing the programme budget implications of more than one draft resolution in a single document created problems with regard to their adoption. Agreeing with the concerns voiced by Cuba and Kenya, he therefore hoped that transparency would be achieved in the future by individually setting forth the financial implications for each draft resolution. Meanwhile, he supported the amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 proposed by Singapore.

29. Mrs. MBELLA-NGOMBA (Cameroon) pointed out that only the Cuban proposal took account of the decision in the Vienna Declaration to strengthen the Centre for Human Rights by using existing and extrabudgetary resources.

30. Mr. TROTTIER (Canada), supporting the statements made by Greece, Costa Rica, Chile, the Netherlands, Ireland and Belgium, said that the draft resolution complied with General Assembly resolution 45/248 B VI and the Vienna Declaration. The Committee should therefore send a powerful message to the

(Mr. Trottier, Canada)

Fifth Committee by adopting the text without the introduction of further amendments.

31. Mr. SAHRAOUI (Algeria) said that the Committee could convey messages to the Fifth Committee without contradicting the rules of procedure and the Vienna Declaration.

32. Mr. DEKANY (Hungary) subscribed to the views expressed by Greece and Canada, among others, and pointed out that the Committee had just adopted draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.38, which unambiguously endorsed the Vienna Declaration. He therefore urged all delegations to take the equally unambiguous step of adopting draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, which was consistent with the Vienna Declaration and the draft resolution just adopted.

33. Mr. BOISSON (Monaco) proposed that the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 should be preceded by an additional paragraph which read: "Bearing in mind United Nations General Assembly resolution 45/248". The remainder of the draft resolution should remain unchanged.

34. Mr. LIEU Zhenmin (China) said he agreed with the views expressed by Cuba, Kenya, Egypt, Singapore and Cameroon. Being qualified only to make a general recommendation on strengthening the Centre for Human Rights, the Committee should endeavour to reach a consensus, which could be achieved by adopting the compromise formula proposed by Singapore.

35. Ms. MURUGESAN (India), endorsing the idea of sending a strong political message to the Fifth Committee, said that her delegation could agree to the amendments proposed by both Cuba and Singapore. The proposed Cuban amendment, however, still failed to preclude additional resources. She also shared the concern over the non-availability of specific programme budget implications for draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, which India had not co-sponsored in view of the ambiguity contained in paragraph 6.

36. Mr. PALIHAKKARA (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation firmly supported draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 and agreed that a strong political message should be sent to the Fifth Committee, in accordance with the Vienna Declaration, which clearly recognized the need to increase substantially resources for the Centre for Human Rights. As some delegations were obviously concerned with certain language contained in the draft resolution, his delegation would agree to specifying "appropriate resources" in paragraph 6, since to do so in no way diluted the strong political message contained therein.

37. Mr. SHARP (Australia) joined the previous speakers who had supported the existing text of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49. There appeared to be a consensus that it was up to the Fifth Committee to make decisions on questions of administration and budget. However, the Third Committee should not shy away from its responsibility to make policy recommendations and to send strong political messages to the Fifth Committee on recommendations which, in the case in point, had been made at the highest level by the World Conference on Human Rights.

38. Mr. BIGGAR (Ireland), agreeing with the previous speaker, added that to seek to dilute the political message contained in paragraphs 2 and 6, in the form suggested either by the representative of Cuba or the representative of Singapore, would seriously undermine the consensus reached in Vienna. His delegation believed that neither proposal would command consensus and that the draft resolution should be adopted as prepared and orally revised at the previous meeting.

39. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) clarified that paragraph 6 had been orally revised to insert the words: "without diverting resources from development programmes and activities of the United Nations" at the end of the paragraph. His delegation favoured adopting draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 as orally revised, and did not support any other proposed amendment.

40. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation supported the statements made by the representatives of Chile, Belgium, New Zealand, Ireland and others, specifying the need to send the message agreed upon at Vienna to the Fifth Committee. If consensus could not be reached on the draft resolution under discussion, her delegation proposed taking a vote.

41. Mr. MAZLAN (Malaysia) said that his delegation approved of the draft resolution as orally revised, together with the Cuban amendment to paragraph 6, but since certain delegations clearly objected to certain language, in the interest of reaching consensus, his delegation supported Singapore's proposed amendments.

42. Mrs. ARUNGU-OLENDE (Kenya) said that her delegation strongly supported the draft resolution as orally revised, and welcomed the amendment to paragraph 6. While her delegation was ready to adopt the draft resolution as it stood, she agreed that it lacked clarity.

43. Mr. OULD MOHAMED LEMINE (Mauritania) said that his delegation had co-sponsored the draft resolution and believed it dealt with important issues that deserved consensus. Therefore, it was willing to consider the problems raised by various delegations and agreed that paragraphs 2 and 6 would benefit from clarification. Since the proposed amendments did not fundamentally alter the text, his delegation preferred adoption of the Cuban proposal.

44. Mr. RATA (New Zealand), supported by Mr. NIETO (Argentina), said that, as a sponsor of A/C.3/48/L.49, his delegation fully supported the draft resolution as it stood. He agreed with the statements made by the representatives of Greece, the Netherlands, Chile, Belgium, Canada, Australia and others, and emphasized the Third Committee's responsibility to follow up on recommendations adopted at the Vienna Conference, one of which was to increase the financial resources available to the Centre for Human Rights.

45. Mr. HAMZAH (Singapore) said that, although he preferred to retain his initial proposal, he was willing to make a second proposal, in line with the wording adopted at Vienna, which consisted in inserting the phrase "from within the existing and future regular budgets", in paragraph 2, immediately following

(Mr. Hamzah, Singapore)

the words "1994-1995" and also in paragraph 6, following the word "resources", to replace "from the regular budget".

46. Ms. SEMAFUMU (Uganda) said her delegation supported the second proposal made by the representative of Singapore.

47. Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile) suggested that the Committee adopt draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 as it stood, and that the Chairman attach to it an accompanying statement, indicating that it was the understanding of the Third Committee that draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 in no way prejudged the outcome of consideration by the Fifth Committee of that draft resolution.

48. Mrs. MBELLA-NGOMBA (Cameroon), emphasizing full support for draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, said that her delegation endorsed the second amendment proposed by the representative of Singapore. In the event that that amendment was adopted, her delegation would ask to become a sponsor.

49. Mr. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba), emphasizing his delegation's commitment to draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, questioned why a statement of programme budget implications had not been submitted as requested a week earlier, and he requested that one should be submitted in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure.

50. Mr. DRAKAKIS (Greece), speaking as one of the sponsors, proposed that paragraph 6 should be revised to read:

> "6. Requests the Secretary-General and Member States to ensure that additional resources from within the existing and future regular budgets of the United Nations are accorded to the Centre for Human Rights to enable it to carry out, in full and on time, the mandates contained in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, without diverting resources from development programmes and activities of the United Nations;".

51. The CHAIRMAN said that he had been informed that draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 had no programme budget implications. In clarification, he cited part of the statement read out by the Secretary of the Committee, which read: "In the context of the proposed programme budget for 1994-1995, the Secretary-General has made proposals to increase resources for the Centre for Human Rights".

52. Mr. DRAKAKIS (Greece) said that the sponsors could accept paragraph 6 worded in the following way:

> "Requests the Secretary-General and Member States to ensure that appropriate additional resources from within the existing and future regular budgets are accorded to the Centre for Human Rights ...".

Taken with the Chairman's statement that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications, the Committee should now be able to adopt it.

53. Ms. MURUGESAN (India) agreed with the proposal made by the representative of Greece and added that in order for the sense of part II, paragraph 10, of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action to be reflected adequately, she suggested inserting the words "reinforced by voluntary funding" after "Centre for Human Rights" in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution.

54. Mr. DRAKAKIS (Greece) said that, as the Committee was approaching a useful compromise, it would be helpful if no further proposals were made. He supported the proposal made by Chile.

55. Paragraph 6, as revised, would read:

> "6. Requests the Secretary-General and Member States to ensure that appropriate additional resources from within the existing and future regular budgets of the United Nations are accorded to the Centre for Human Rights to enable it to carry out, in full and on time, the mandates contained in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, without diverting resources from development programmes and activities of the United Nations;".

56. The CHAIRMAN read out the statement he would make to accompany draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49:

> "It is my understanding that in approving resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 the Third Committee does not in any way prejudge the outcome of the consideration that the Fifth Committee will give to this resolution, in particular to operative paragraphs 2 and 6."

57. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49, as orally revised, was adopted.

58. Ms. SEMAFUMU (Uganda) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that the programme budget implications for paragraph 6 were contained in document A/C.3/48/L.80, that paragraph 2 had no programme budget implications and that therefore draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.49 as a whole had no programme budget implications.

59. Mr. AIZAWA (Japan) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution in order to send a strong political message on the strengthening of the Centre for Human Rights.

60. Mr. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution in the light of the Chairman's statement on programme budget implications.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.37/Rev.2

61. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.37/Rev.2, entitled "Situation of human rights in Estonia and Latvia", paragraph 4 of which had been amended as a result of consultations among the interested delegations. The amendment read:

> "4. Requests the Secretary-General to keep Member States informed on the situation of human rights in Estonia and Latvia and decides to consider this item at one of its future sessions".

62. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.37/Rev.2, as orally amended, was adopted.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.37/Rev.2, the proposed amendment in document A/C.3/48/L.83 was no longer necessary.

64. Mr. PARSHIKOV (Russian Federation), supported by Mr. AINSO (Estonia), expressed sincere gratitude to all those, especially the delegations of Belgium and Sweden, that had worked so hard to reach a compromise on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.37/Rev.2.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.53

65. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.53, entitled "International covenants on human rights", and said that it had no programme budget implications. He read out a minor correction to the fourth preambular paragraph.

66. Mr. KASOULIDES (Cyprus) and Mrs. LIMJUCO (Philippines) said that they wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

67. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.53 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.54

68. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.54, entitled "International Decade of the World's Indigenous People", and said that the programme budget implications were to be found in document A/C.3/48/L.80. He recalled that, at the 50th meeting, paragraph 9 of the draft resolution had been orally revised by the representative of Australia, the words "taking fully into account through appropriate channels the views of indigenous people" being deleted and the words "with Governments and in partnership with indigenous people" being inserted after the word "consider".

69. Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile) said that his delegation wished to join the sponsors.

70. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.54, as orally revised, was adopted.

71. Ms. JAHAN (Bangladesh) said that her country had espoused the cause of indigenous peoples everywhere and in that spirit had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. However, she wished to make it clear that the term "indigenous people" referred only to the original inhabitants of a country and not to the minorities that might have settled there.

72. Mr. LIEU Zhenmin (China) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and reserved its right to give an explanation of vote in the plenary Assembly.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.68/Rev.1

73. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.68/Rev.1, entitled "Situation of human rights in El Salvador", and said that there were no programme budget implications.

74. Mr. ALBIN (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, read out some small corrections to the text of the draft resolution, and said that Hungary and Panama wished to join the sponsors.

75. Mr. TROTTIER (Canada) said that his country, too, wished to join the sponsors.

76. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.68/Rev.1 was adopted.

77. Mr. MIN (Myanmar), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that during the Committee's discussion of agenda item 114 (c), the representative of the United States had made highly disparaging remarks against his Government. He had demonstrated a singular lack of knowledge of Myanmar's history and traditions when he had referred to the Tatmadaw (Myanmar Defence Services) as a prime instrument of human-rights abuse. The Tatmadaw was a highly disciplined self-defence force with a strong sense of patriotism which had always shouldered its responsibility to defend the nation against all internal and external dangers. He categorically rejected allegations that it was perpetrating human-rights violations against the Myanmar people. The regret expressed by the representative of the United States that draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.70 had not urged Member States to consider policies to restrict voluntarily arms sales to Myanmar betrayed the intention of the United States to seek, in an incremental fashion, the imposition of an arms embargo on Myanmar.

78. Furthermore, he had alleged that there had been an unprecedented expansion of the Myanmar Defence Services, which amounted to questioning the right of every sovereign State to determine its own security needs in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter, a right which the United States itself jealously guarded.

79. The United States representative had also asserted that draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.70 should have urged the United Nations specialized agencies operating in Myanmar to ensure that funds expended in that country reached the intended grass-roots-level recipients. In conformity with decision No. 93/21 of the United Nations Development Programme Governing Council, all assistance from

(Mr. Min, Myanmar)

UNDP and related funds was now clearly targeted towards programmes having grass-roots-level impact. That meant that the idea put forward by the United States representative, which seemed to differ materially from the Governing Council decision, could only be taken as a politically motivated attempt to have all United Nations aid-giving agencies bypass the lawful Government and deal directly with the people at the grass-roots level.

80. The ideas proposed by the United States, if accepted, would set a most dangerous precedent not only for Myanmar but for the majority of Member States, particularly those that were small and weak. The United States had made every effort to amend the draft resolution in the ways described above, and the fact that its proposals had not been taken up by most of the other Western countries attested to their extremist nature. Indeed, they could be fairly described as bullying tactics, but such tactics would not work.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.